AN EXAMINATION OF Dr. Sherlock's Book, ENTITULED, The Case of the Allegiance DUE TO SOVEREIGN POWERS, STATED and RESOLVED, &c.

BY

JAMES PARKINSON, M.A.

LONDON:
Printed for David Pap, M.DC.XCI.

XUM

Sherlock's Case of Allegiance

is in Vol: 2.:

AN EXAMINATION OF Dr. Sherlock's Book, ENTITULED, *The Case of the ALLEGIANCE, &c.*

I Have Examined Dr. *Sherlock*'s Book, Entituled, *The Case of the Allegiance due to Sovereign Powers*, &c. And I must own, that he has done what I expected he would; For I expected he would ſtart ſome new Doctrines to maintain his old Principles: And he has fully anſwer'd my Expectation.

He tells us, *he has renounc'd no Principle that ever he taught, excepting one in the Caſe of Reſiſtance*: ſo that though he be a fallible Creature, yet, it ſeems, he is but one degree beneath Infallibility. Caſe of Allegiance. *Pref.*

But tho *he may be miſtaken, yet this he is ſure of, That he never acted with more ſincerity in any Affair of his whole life, than he has done in this matter, from the beginning to the end*; for which I will take his word, for I had rather believe, than cenſure and judge him. Caſe of Allegiance. *Pref.*

Though he *refus'd to take the Oaths, yet he never engag'd in any Faction againſt it, nor made it his buſineſs to diſſuade men from it.* But did he not, *when his Opinion was aſk'd, declare his own Thoughts?* And were not his Thoughts againſt it? And was not this enough for the Oracle of the Party, whenever he was conſulted, freely to

declare his Thoughts? Oracles are sometimes dumb, and will give no Answer; but this Doctor was always a Speaking Oracle to the Party. And who can think that he ever spake in vain? Who can believe, that those words which dropp'd from his mouth, and dropp'd into the Ears of those that admired him, and blindly believed in him, could ever fail of making or confirming Non-Swearers.

He had no aversion to the Government of King William *and Queen* Mary; and why should he? The Government surely is almost as good, as it was when the Seven Right Reverend Bishops were sent to the *Tower*; it is almost as good, as it was when Father *Petre* was at the Helm; nay, I will be bold to say, it is very nigh as good, as it was when he assisted at the degrading of the Excellent Mr. *Johnson*. But was he not thankful to God for it? no; only *he had no aversion to it.*

He prayed for King William *and Queen* Mary. One would think, that had he prayed heartily for them in the Church, he would have own'd them in a Court of Justice, by taking the Oath of Allegiance to them: No, this he could not do; he still *refused the Oaths out of pure Principles of Conscience:* but however he prayed for them. *And this was a disposition of mind prepared to receive satisfaction whenever it was offered.* This I believe, and I doubt *his desire of satisfaction has secretly and insensibly distorted his Judgment:* I am sure distorted it is. But is his Judgment always distorted? Was it distorted while he refused the Oaths? And is it distorted now he has taken them? Yes, so it is; his Judgment stood awry before, because he was not for King *William* and Queen *Mary:* and his Judgment still stands awry, because though he swears Allegiance to them, yet he does it in a wrong sense; he swears to them no otherwise, than he would be ready to swear to any Usurper, when setled in the Throne. And I know not what else should have thus *distorted his Judgment*, unless it were *a great desire of satisfaction*; For the Principles, on which he grounds his new Allegiance, are false and precarious, and will satisfy no man, who has not as great a desire of satisfaction, as he himself had.

But though he desired satisfaction, yet, it seems, it did not come presently to him: he did in his thoughts ever and anon make a step towards King *William*, but still his old Principles drew him back; and in this state of wavering and doubting he continued almost two years; moving forwards, and backwards; looking sometimes on King *William*, who had God's Authority to bestow

the

the Preferments; and sometimes on King *James*, who had (as he would make us believe) the Legal Right. *He likewise drew up his thoughts in writing, and shewed them to some of his Friends, and told them where he stuck; but stick he did, and could find no help for it.* What? was the desire of satisfaction grown languid and weak? no; but though that was as strong as ever, yet that alone could not do the job. Still *he stuck, and had stuck to this day, had he not been relieved by Bishop* Overall's *Convocation Book.*

Doubtless the Members of that Convocation spent their time to good purpose; and Dr *Overall* did great service to the Church by registring what passed in that venerable Assembly: for had it not been for his Convocation-Book, this Reverend Doctor had *forfeited the exercise of his Ministry for a mere mistake.* But what were the wonders, that this Convocation-Book has wrought on him? why, it *confirm'd his former Notions, and suggested some new thoughts to him, which removed those difficulties that he could not conquer before.* So that, it seems, he would not have us think, he had all his good Notions from the Convocation-Book; no, he had many of them before he read it, and that Book did only confirm them. And besides all this, he tells us, That *The venerable Authority of a Convocation gave him greater freedom and liberty of thinking, which the apprehension of novelty and singularity had cramp'd before.* And now the Doctor swells, and is puffed up with the Sacred Authority of a Convocation. His Soul was not at liberty before; it was chain'd and fetter'd, and he was afraid to let his thoughts rove and wander; but, now he has the Convocation on his side, his thoughts are at liberty, and he resolves to wander; and I likewise resolve to follow him, as far as I shall see it necessary.

Dr *Overall* was no Bishop during the time of that Convocation, nor for some years after that.

Preface.

At his first setting out, he complains that the *Controversy is perplext*; but I doubt, that before I shall get to the end of his Book, I shall have greater reason to complain, that he has perplext it more. But what is it that has perplexed the Controversie? Why, it is *the intermixing the dispute of Right, with the duty of Obedience*; as if we could be bound to obey one who has no right to our Obedience: it is a *making the legal Right of Princes to their Thrones, the only reason and foundation of the Allegiance of Subjects*: and I would fain know what other foundation of Allegiance there can be? For *Allegiance is Obedience according to Law; that is to say, not a blind and absolute Obedience, but such an Obedience as is defined and limited by the Law.*

Page 1. Case of Allegiance.

Page 1.

P. 1.

Bishop of *Sarum*'s Pastoral Letter, *p.* 6.

He-

Page 2. He blames those that have not taken the Oaths, because *they go wholly upon this Principle, That Allegiance is due only to Legal Right: and take away*, says he, *that, and you remove all the difficulties they labour under*; and I suppose it is for their sakes, that he has, as far as in him lay, taken away the Legal Right from their Majesties, that so he might remove all the difficulties which the Non-swearers labour under. But he seems not to care what becomes of their Majesties, nor what difficulties he throws them into. And he blames likewise many of *those that have writ in defence of the new Oaths*, because *they suppose*
Page 1. *that a Legal Right is necessary to make Allegiance due, and have therefore endeavoured to justify the Legal Right of their present Majesties.* This it seems is become a Crime, *to justify the Legal Right of Their present Majesties*, which yet if we do not justify, we condemn our selves. But why should we not justify the Legal Right of Their present Majesties? Why should we, for the sake of a few Non-swearees, betray our Cause, and tacitly own, that we believe King *William* and Queen *Mary* to be Usurpers? He gives two reasons for this; and I think he is a very bold Man that will venture to give reasons for so unreasonable a thing. Now his Reasons are, 1*st*, Because *it is unfit to dispute the Rights of Princes.* 2*d*, Because *it is unnecessary.*

1. *Because 'tis unfit to dispute the Rights of Princes:* But though
Page 1. it may not be fit to dispute the Right of a Prince, when settled on the Throne, yet it might have been fit to assert it; though *no Government can permit it to be a Question*, yet it might have been his declared Opinion; one would think that he, out of gratitude to his Royal Patron, should have own'd him to be Rightful King; nay, methinks his interest should have prompted him to it: For I must tell him, there is this in the case, which he little thought of, That if K. *William* have not a legal Right to the Crown, Dr. *W. Sherlock* can have no legal Right to the Mastership of the Temple: For 'tis the Law alone, that invests King *William* with a Power to bestow these Preferments; and therefore if the King be only King *de facto*, that is, in his sense, an Usurper, I know not how the Doctor will be able to make out, that he is any more than *de facto* Master of the Temple, without a Legal Right to his Place. A froward Prince would hardly bear such ill treatment as this, I'm sure his Legal King would not; and a mild King does not deserve it from him. I doubt not but he has done a great deal of mischief (though I do not say he design'd it) by refusing to take the Oaths; And did it become him to publish

such

such a Book to the World, and, by implication, declare to all his fellow Subjects, That he for his part does not look upon King *William* and Queen *Mary*, to whom he has sworn Allegiance, to be any more than a King and Queen *de facto*, that is (according to him) Usurpers?

2. He says, *'Tis unnecessary to defend the Legal Right of King* William *and Queen* Mary: For whom is it unnecessary? For him, it may be, because he does not believe it; but 'tis not unnecessary for those that own their Legal Right: Nay, there is nothing more necessary than this; and therefore two Parliaments, this and the last, have recogniz'd their Title. But it seems those Parliaments did a very needless thing, and wanted this Doctor to give them better Advice; for he that can sit in his Study, and there make and unmake Kings at his pleasure, may surely be fit to give Counsel to Parliaments.

The Doctor and I are in one thing agreed, That Allegiance is due to King *William* and Queen *Mary*; but we differ about the foundation and reason of our Allegiance: He thinks *that we ought not to take the consideration of Right into the Settlement of Government*; Page 18. for he says, *A Prince may be settled in his Throne without Legal Right, and when he is so, God has made him our King, and requires our Obedience*: and I cannot be of his Opinion. He says, *That his Allegiance may be due to one who has no Legal Right to Govern him*; I say, that I owe Allegiance to none but him who has the Legal Right.

I shall therefore do these two things:

1. I shall give my own Opinion, with the Grounds and Reasons of it.
2. I shall examine his.

I. I shall give my Opinion, with the Grounds and Reasons of it; which I shall do in these following Propositions:

1. Allegiance, is Obedience according to Law.

2. No Man can have any Right to my Allegiance, who is not my Lawful King. These Propositions are, I think, in themselves evident, and need no proof: And therefore,

3. King *William* and Queen *Mary* are Lawful and Rightful King and Queen of *England*, and the Dominions thereunto belonging; This appears plainly from that Declaration which the Lords and Commons Assembled at *Westminster*, presented to their Highnesses the

Declaration of Lords and Commons presented to the Prince and Princess of Orange.

the Prince and Princess of *Orange*, *Feb.* 13. 1688. wherein they set forth, That *King* James, *by the assistance of divers evil Counsellors, Judges, and Ministers, employ'd by him, had endeavoured to subvert the Protestant Religion, and the Laws and Liberties of this Kingdom*, and many instances they give of his misgovernment; and that he had *Abdicated the Government, and the Throne was become Vacant.* And then they assert the several Rights of the Subject, which the late King had notoriously violated; and last of all, *Having an entire confidence that his Highness the Prince of* Orange *would preserve them from the violation of their Rights, and from all attempts upon their Religion, Laws and Liberties*; *they resolve, That* William *and* Mary, *Prince and Princess of* Orange, *be, and be declared King and Queen of* England, France *and* Ireland, *and the Dominions thereunto belonging.* And *the Prince and Princess of* Orange, *at the Request, and by the Advice of the Lords and Commons, did accept the Crown and Royal Dignity of King and Queen of* England, France *and* Ireland, *and the Dominions and Territories thereto belonging.* They did *accept* the Crown, they did not *snatch* it by force and violence; They were no Conquerors, no Usurpers.

1°. *Willielmi & Mariæ. c.* 1.

And afterwards, in an Act past *December* 16. 1689. the same Parliament recogniz'd their Title in these words; *The Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, seriously considering how it hath pleas'd Almighty God in his marvellous Providence, and merciful Goodness to this Nation, to provide and preserve Their said Majesties Royal Persons most happily to reign over us upon the Throne of Their Ancestors (for which they render unto him from the bottom of their hearts their humblest thanks and praises) do truly, firmly, assuredly, and in the sincerity of their hearts, think, and do hereby recognize, acknowledge and declare, That King* James *the Second having abdicated the Government, and Their Majesties having accepted the Crown and Royal Dignity, Their said Majesties did become, were, and are, and of right ought to be by the Laws of this Realm, our Sovereign Liege Lord and Lady, King and Queen of* England, France *and* Ireland, *and the Dominions thereunto belonging; in, and to whose Princely Persons the Royal State, Crown and Dignity of the said Realms, with all Honours, Titles, &c. to the same belonging and appertaining, are most fully, rightfully and entirely invested and incorporated, united and annexed.*

And when that Parliament was dissolved, and a new one summoned to meet at *Westminster*, there was a new Recognition of Their Title in these words, *We Your Majesties most Humble and Loyal Subjects, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present*

sent Parliament Assembled, do beseech Your Most Excellent Majesties, that it may be publish'd and declar'd in this High Court of Parliament, and Enacted by Authority of the same, That we do recognize, and acknowledg Your Majesties were, are, and of Right ought to be by the Laws of this Realm, our Sovereign Liege Lord and Lady, King and Queen of England, France *and* Ireland, *&c.*

And if this be not a Legal Title, I know not what a Legal Title means. It is as good a Title as *Edward* the Confessor had; as good a one, as *W.* 1. *W.* 2. *Hen* 1. K. *Stephen*, *Hen.* 2. K. *John*, *Hen.* 3. *Edw.* 3. *Hen.* 4, 5, 6, 7. Q. *Mary*, or Q. *Elizabeth*, (one or other of those two Queens) either had, or could pretend to; and these, whom I have mentioned, had as truly a Legal Right to the Crown, as any of the rest whom I make no mention of: And the true Reason why I instance in these, is this, Because it is certain that none of these were Kings by any Divine Right of Succession.

If Proximity of Blood be absolutely necessary to a Legal Title, then *Edw.* the Confessor had none; for when he ascended the Throne, *Edgar Atheling*, his Elder Brother's Son, was alive. Then *W.* 1. had none, both because he was illegitimate, and also because *Edgar Atheling* was still living. Then *W.* 2. and *Hen.* 1. could have none, while their Elder Brother *Robert* was living. Then K. *Stephen* could have none; for the Right of Blood was in *Maud* the Empress, *Hen.* the first's Daughter. Then *Hen.* 2. could have none, so long as his Mother *Maud* was alive. Then K. *John* could have none; for *Arthur*, his Elder Brother's Son, had all the Right that Proximity of Blood could give. Then *Hen.* 3. could have none, at least, not before the 24th year of his Reign or thereabouts; at what time *Eleanor*, Sister to Prince *Arthur*, died. Then *Edw.* 3. could have none, during the Life of his unfortunate Father *Edw.* 2. who was Depos'd. Then *Hen.* 4, 5, 6, 7. could have none, there being another Family which had the proximity of Blood on their side. Then Q. *Mary*, or Q. *Elizabeth*, (one or other of them) could have none; for it is certain that one of the two must be illegitimate, because *Katherine*, Q. *Mary*'s Mother, was living at the time when Q. *Elizabeth* was born: And yet we do not find that any Learned and Pious Bishops, or any other dignified Clergy-men, ever refused to accept of Ecclesiastical Preferments from any of the forementioned Princes, and to swear Allegiance to them. Nor can it be said, that they swore Allegiance to them as to Kings *de facto*, but not *de jure*; at leastwise, this cannot be affirmed of those who lived before the Reign of *Edw.* 4. for then arose this distinction, and not before.

The *Scotch* Parliament calls this a Villanous distinction: I think I may say, it is a distinction that is not well grounded; for it seems to me to be founded on a false Principle, *That Proximity of Blood gives such an indefeasible Right or Title to the Crown, that he, who is next on the Royal Line, whatever his natural or moral incapacities are, cannot be barr'd from succeeding to the Throne:* Which is directly contrary to a Statute made in the 13*th* of Q. *Eliz. ch.* 1. wherein it is affirmed, That *the King, Lords, and Commons, have right to limit and bind the Crown of this Realm, and the Descent, Inheritance, and Government thereof:* And 'twas by the said Statute made Treason, during the Life of that Queen, to hold, affirm, or maintain the contrary; and, after her decease, forfeiture of Goods and Chattels; and I know not of any Law of God that the Queen and Parliament broke when they made that Statute. A King *de facto* is not, as the Doctor imagines, an Usurper, but he is a Lawful King; He is one to whom our Allegiance is due, (as appears from a Statute made in the 11*th* of *Hen.* 7. *ch.* 1.) and Allegiance is due to none, but him who has a Legal Right; for Allegiance is *Obedience according to Law*, and consequently must be paid to him to whom the Law directs us to pay it; and to say that the Law directs us to pay our Obedience to one, who has no Legal Right to it, does not sound well.

4. It follows from hence, that our Allegiance is due to K. *William* and Q. *Mary*; for it is due to a Lawful King, and it has been shew'd, That Their Majesties are Lawful and Rightful King and Queen. And this is the foundation of my Allegiance.

II. I must now examin Dr. *Sherlock*'s Opinion concerning this matter.

Page 10. His notion is this, *That all Sovereign Princes, who are settled in their Thrones, are plac'd there by God, and invested with his Authority, and therefore must be obeyed by all Subjects as the Ministers of God, without enquiring into their Legal Right and Title to the Throne.* And he tells us, That *the Convocation has determin'd two great points, whereon this whole Controversy turns:* 1. *That those Princes, who have no Legal Right to their Thrones, may yet have God's Authority.* 2. *That when they are throughly settled in their Thrones, they are invested with God's Authority, and must be reverenc'd and obeyed by all, who live within their Territories and Dominions, as well Priests as People.*

This is his Doctrine, *And this*, says he, *I will endeavour to prove from the Authority of Scripture and Reason.*

Scrip-

Scripture and Reason I am always ready to hear; he that brings me a plain Scripture proof, commands my assent; and he that gives me a good Reason, will easily persuade me: And therefore though the Venerable Authority of a Convocation stands in the front of his Book, yet I intend it shall Lackey after his Reasons, and his Scripture Proofs.

SECT. I.

Dr. Sherlock's *Proofs from Scripture and Reason Examined.*

HIS *Proofs from Reason and Scripture must*, he says, *necessarily be intermixt, and interwoven with each other; and to set the matter in as clear a light as he can, he reduceth the whole into the Propositions following:*

Prop. 1. *That all Civil Power and Authority is from God*, &c. This is loosly expressed, and in general terms, and may be allow'd to be in some sense true, and therefore I will let it pass, and will desire him to consider, that so is every thing from God, except Sin; so are Riches and Honours from God, tho Men bestow them; so is the Doctor himself from God, tho his Father begat him; and so is his Book from God; for God gave him Power to write it, though I do not think, God gave him any Authority.

Prop. 2. *Civil Power and Authority is no otherwise from God, than as God gives this Power and Authority to particular persons*, &c. A great discovery this! That God does in some sense give whatever may be said in any sense to come from him; as if a creature could snatch any thing from his Creator against his will. But how is Civil Power and Authority from God? And how does he give Civil Power and Authority to particular persons? He tells us,

Prop. 3. *There are but three ways whereby God gives this Power and Authority to any persons*; either

1. *By Nature*; *Thus Parents have a natural superiority over their Children; but by what bounds this Paternal and Patriarchal Authority was limited, we cannot tell; 'tis in vain to enquire after it now:* And so he has taken his leave of Sir *Robert Filmer*'s *Patriarcha*.

2. *By a particular nomination*; *Thus God made Kings only in Jewry*; but this does not at all concern us.

3. *By the diſpoſals of his Providence:* That God Governs the World, I am very ſure, for his Word aſſures me of it; and 'tis the greateſt comfort of my Life, to conſider that there is a Wiſe, Juſt and Good God who Rules the World. But how does he Rule the World? How does he ſet up and pull down Kings, and bring about the great Revolutions and Changes of Governments? Does God preſcribe to any people a form of Government? Does he appoint or dictate the particular Laws of each Country? Does he nominate the Supreme Magiſtrate? Does he ſet bounds to the Supreme Governor's Power? No, he does none of theſe things; but leaves them to the Reaſon and Prudence of Men. But yet God is not altogether unconcern'd; he does not ſit on his Throne in Heaven a mere Spectator of human Affairs, without ever intermedling in them: But he interpoſes, as becomes a Wiſe Governor of the World, by directing and guiding the minds; by moving and inclining, by checking and reſtraining the wills of his creatures in an unknown manner. How, or in what manner he directs the greater and the leſſer Wheels of Providence, we cannot tell; but that he does direct them, is not to be doubted.

In the general, I think we ought to lay down this Rule, Never to aſcribe to God any thing that is unworthy of him, that is diſagreeable to his Wiſdom, or Juſtice, or Equity, or Goodneſs; and therefore ſince his Divine Laws are full of Wiſdom, Equity, Juſtice, and Goodneſs, we ought never to think that he who has oblig'd Mankind by ſuch excellent Laws, does by any ſecret influence move them to a violation of them. He indeed ſees the unruly Wills and Affections of Men, and knows that they will abuſe the Power they have, and unjuſtly catch at more to oppreſs their Brethren; and he in his Wiſdom permits ſometimes that they ſhould attain their wicked ends; but when ever he does ſo, we muſt not take it for a mark of his approbation; nor argue thus, That becauſe they proſper, therefore God is pleaſed with their doings; for he will certainly, ſooner or later, puniſh them for what they do. But you'll ſay, when an Uſurper proſpers, and aſcends the Throne, and is ſetled in it, Does not God then make him a King, and inveſt him with his Authority? No ſuch matter; he is ſtill a private Man, without Right to Kingly Government, unleſs an Unjuſt action can create a Right. But though an unjuſt action cannot create a Right, yet God can give him a Right. True; But how ſhall I know that he does ſo? That, ſays the Doctor, you may know by the event; if you ſee him able to cruſh whom he pleaſes, and ſeated upon the Royal Throne,

aſſure

assure your self, that God has set him up, and made him a King; for *the most high ruleth in the Kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will, and setteth up over it the baseſt of Men.* Dan. 4.17 Now in answer to this, I allow the Doctor, that God does in some sense set up a Tyrant; but then I desire him to consider, that Satan likewise sets him up, and wicked Men set him up, and he sets up himself. He sets up himself by abusing the Power he has, by encreasing it more and more through his restless Ambition, and by raising of Forces to gain the Sovereign Power. And wicked Men set him up, by giving him assistance for the accomplishing of his wicked designs; not that they love to be Slaves, but they are willing to enslave others, and tyrannize over them. And Satan sets him up, by tempting him to get the Sovereign Power, and make himself a God upon Earth. And lastly, God sets him up; But how does God set him up? Why, God gives him those natural powers and faculties both of Mind and Body, which fit him for great Undertakings; and moreover he in his Providence gives him many favourable opportunities for encreasing his Wealth, and enlarging his Power, and strengthning his Interest amongst his Fellow Subjects: And these are a Ladder, by which he may possibly climb to the Sovereignty. And though God has in his Word forbidden him to invade the Rights of others, and advance himself to the Throne by unjust means, yet he permits him to do so; though he, who sets bounds to the raging Sea, *And says, Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further; and here shall thy proud waves be stay'd*; Job 38.11. could easily restrain an Ambitious Usurper, and stop him from ascending the Royal Throne; yet he, for wise ends, suffers him to go on and prosper in his unjust Enterprizes. Thus God sets up a Tyrant, (but gives him no Authority) and the Devil sets him up, and wicked Men set him up, and he sets up himself. And this is agreeable to the Style and Language of Scripture, which tells us in one place, That *Satan stood up against* Israel, *and provoked* David *to number* Israel; And in another place, *That the anger of the Lord was kindled against* Israel, *and he moved* David *against them, to say, Go number* Israel *and* Judah; So that here the same sinful Action is in words ascrib'd to God and Satan, for both are here said to have mov'd *David* to number *Israel*, and the word in the Original is in both places the same; it is יסת, which signifies to Seduce, Entice, or Persuade; and who will think that God does persuade or entice men to sin, otherwise than by giving Satan permission and leave to tempt and entice them? 1 Chron. 21.1. 2 Sam. 24. 1.

Well then, God never sets up Usurpers so as to give them any Autho-

P. 13. Authority; and therefore that is very falſe which Dr. *Sherlock* delivers for a certain truth, *viz. That God never ſuffers an Aſpiring Prince to aſcend the Throne, but when he thinks fit to make him King*; for he is not made a King upon his aſcending the Throne, nor has he any Regal Authority, unleſs the Dr. can prove, that barely to aſcend the Throne, is to be a King: And when he can prove that, I'll undertake to make out, That to aſcend the Temple-Pulpit, is to be Maſter of the Temple; and then he muſt have a care of getting another to preach for him.

P. 13. *But*, ſays he, *unleſs all Kings are ſet up by God, and inveſted with his Authority, we can never know what Kings have God's Authority, who thoſe are whom we mu't obey out of Conſcience, and whom we muſt not obey.* Which is juſt as if one ſhould ſay, Unleſs every one that comes up into the Temple-Pulpit be Maſter of the Temple, one cannot be able to know, who is, and who is not Maſter of the Temple. One would admire that one, who has ſo good a faculty of explaining Myſteries, ſhould not be able to diſtinguiſh between a King and a Tyrant, nor know the difference between Accepting, and Snatching of a Crown.

Prop. 4. *All Kings are equally rightful with reſpect to God.* This I utterly deny. For God ſurely ſees and knows, that one aſcends the Throne by Fraud, and Perjury, and Violence, and Oppreſſion, and Murther; and that another is freely choſen by the Voice of the People, for the great eſteem they have of his Juſtice, and Valour, and other noble Qualities that fit him for the exerciſe of Sovereign Power. Now will any man ſay, that a Holy and Juſt God makes no diſtinction between theſe two? Will any man affirm, that God puts no difference between one that enters by the Door into the Sheepfold, and another that climbs up ſome other way? Between the Shepherd who feeds the Sheep, and a Thief or Robber that comes to ſteal them? Men do not judge them to be equally Rightful Kings, and yet Men judge by a Rule that God has given them, *viz.* the Rule of right Reaſon; and why ſhould we think that God judges otherwiſe in this Caſe, than Men do? Men, who judge thus, are not miſtaken in their Judgments; and I do not ſee any reaſon, why God, who cannot be miſtaken, ſhould not judge in this Caſe as Men, who are not miſtaken, do. In ſhort, If Men, who think an Uſurper is not a Rightful King, be not miſtaken, it is reaſonable to conclude, God thinks ſo too; and on the other hand, If God thinks an Uſurper to be as much a Rightful King as any other, methinks this ſhould be a very good Reaſon for us to think ſo too: For if we think as God thinks, we ſhall not err in our

our thonghts. But how does he prove that all Kings are equally rightful with respect to God? *Because*, says he, *they are plac'd in the Throne by God.* And are they not plac'd in the Throne by Men? is not the hand of Man visible in this matter? Nay, is not the hand of Man the only visible hand? and do not the hands of violent Men set the Crown on the Head of an Usurper? and does he think, that such a one is with respect to God as Rightful a King, as God's Anointed King *David* was? I grant, that if God were the only Person that plac'd Princes in the Throne; if he did always himself put the Scepter into their hands, and by a Voice from Heaven, or an express nomination, made Kings; there would then be no question, but all would be equally Rightful Kings, though not equally good ones: As *Saul*'s Title was as good as that of *David*, though he was not so good a King. But since Men are concern'd in advancing Princes to the Throne, and they may, and do often, by unjust means place them thereon; to say that all Kings are equally Rightful with respect to God, is to say that God has no regard to the sinful Means that are us'd to set up such Kings; it is to confound the Notions of Good and Evil, of Right and Wrong, and to turn the World into a mere *Bedlam.* Add to this, That if all Kings were equally Rightful with respect to God, then why should he complain as he did, *They have set up Kings, but not by me*; Hos. 8. 4. *they have made Princes, and I knew it not?* Since, if what this Author affirms, be true, God himself set up the Kings which they set up, and made the Princes which they made; and did as truly make them, *As if they had been expressly nominated, and anointed by a Prophet at God's Command, as* Saul *and* David *were.* P. 13.

To conclude this Head, If all Princes when they are advanced to the Throne, by what means soever they are lifted up above their Brethren, be equally Rightful Kings, then surely they have equally a Commission from God, to act as Kings; but Usurpers have no Commission at all from God to rule his people; they have no Authority, and they can have none, unless God's word has lost its Authority; for I'm sure, that forbids all unjust Usurpations, and thereby plainly tells us, That Usurpers have no Authority, unless God should give them Authority to do what he in his Word has forbidden; which I hope the Doctor will not affirm.

Prop. 5. *The distinction then between a King* de Jure, *and a King* de Facto, *relates only to Humane Laws*, &c. If by a King *de Facto*; he means, as it is plain he does, an Usurper; and by a King *de Jure*, a Rightful King; I grant, that if the foregoing Proposition were true,

true, this would be true too; for if all Kings be equally Rightful with respect to God, then all Kings are Kings *de Jure* with respect to God; and consequently, as he says, the distinction of a King *de Jure* and *de Facto* would relate only to Humane Laws: So that here is nothing else asserted in this Proposition, but what was in the former. Only I must tell him what I have observ'd already; That this distinction is not to be allowed with respect to Humane Laws; for in *England*, whoever is a King *de Facto*, is also a King *de Jure*, for he has a right to our Allegiance.

Prop. 6. *We can have but one King at a time*; I'll give him this, and I hope King *William* is the Doctor's King.

Prop. 7. *He is our King, who is setled in the Throne in the actual Administration of Sovereign Power*, &c. If he means by *setled*, legally setled, I agree with him; otherwise I deny it. For I know of no other Settlement, but a Legal one, that can make a King: A Settlement without Law, which the Doctor speaks of, is the Settlement not of a King, but of a powerful Usurper: 'tis just such a Settlement as a Thief may have for a time, who breaks open another Man's House, and turns him out, and takes possession of it.

Prop. 8. *Allegiance is due only to the King.* This I freely give him. And from hence he concludes, That *we must pay our Allegiance to him who is our King, though without a Legal Right.* His Supposition is false; for he supposes, that one may be his King without a Legal Right, which I deny: He may be, and is an Usurper, who has no Legal Right, but he is not our King: he is a private Man, intruding himself into a publick Office, which he is not call'd to: and no Allegiance is due to him.

But, says he, *our Allegiance is due to him who is our King, though without a Legal Right, because Allegiance is due only to God's Authority, not to a bare Legal Title without God's Authority.* Here he separates two things, which do always go together; a Legal Right, and God's Authority; for God does not give Authority to any, but those who have a Legal Right. I grant, that God may nominate Kings if he pleases, and then doubtless they would have his Authority without a Legal Right; nor would they need any Legal Right, since they would have a Divine Right, which would be better. But since he does not nominate any Kings, as he formerly did in *Jewry*, we have no way to know who has God's Authority, but by knowing who has the Legal Right.

SECT.

SECT. II.

An Examination of ſome other Reaſons and Arguments, urg'd by Dr. Sherlock *for the further Confirmation of his Doctrine, contain'd in his 4th Section.*

I. HE obſerves, *That the Scripture has given us no Directions in this Caſe, but to ſubmit and pay all the Allegiance of Subjects to the preſent Powers.* Nor was it neceſſary that the Scripture ſhould give us any other directions in this caſe; for why may not Reaſon without Scripture direct us in this caſe, as it did direct Men before the Epiſtle of St. *Paul* to the *Romans* was written? But *Scripture*, he ſays, *makes no diſtinction, that ever he could find, between rightful Kings and Uſurpers.* And what then? Scripture makes no diſtinction that I can find, between my right Hand and my Left; but a little Senſe and Reaſon will teach me to diſtinguiſh. Was it neceſſary for the Apoſtle, when he taught, *Let every Soul be ſubject to the higher Powers*, to have added, *if they be truly the higher Powers; but if they be not the higher Powers, you need not be ſubject to them?* Was it needful, when he ſaid, *Servants obey your Maſters*, to have immediately ſubjoin'd this, *if they be really your Maſters; but if they be not your Maſters, you need not obey them?* Was it neceſſary, when he gave this general Command, *Wives ſubmit your ſelves to your own Husbands*, to have immediately added, *if they be indeed your own Husbands; but if they be not your Husbands, you need not ſubmit your ſelves to them?* No more was it neceſſary for the Apoſtle to diſtinguiſh between a rightful King and an Uſurper; becauſe every one that has but common Senſe and Reaſon, can do this with eaſe, without Apoſtolical help. An Uſurper of Royal Power, is not to be reckon'd amongſt St. *Paul*'s higher Powers; nor is he any more my King, as being not called to that Office, than he can be called my Maſter, with whom I have made no Contract: And therefore to ſay, *the Apoſtle here ſpeaks only of lawful Powers* is not (as he ſays) *gratis dictum*; it being the only reaſonable interpretation that the words can bear.

Had there (ſays he) *been any ſuch Rule before given, to ſubmit to lawful Powers, but not to ſubmit to Uſurpers, there had been ſome*

pretence for understanding St. Paul's *all Power of all legal Power; but there being nothing like this any where in Scripture, if he had intended any such distinction, he ought to have said it in express words, or else no Body could reasonably have understood him, to intend this Precept of Subjection to the higher Powers, only of Powers that had a legal Right.*

Nay, on the contrary, say I, if St. *Paul* had not intended any such distinction, he should in express words have forbidden such a distinction; he should have told us that we ought not to distinguish between rightful Kings and Usurpers; for that we should thus distinguish, Reason will teach us; but that we should not distinguish, can be only Matter of Faith. I would think my Obedience due to an Usurper, if I had plain Scripture for it; but Reason, I am sure, does not teach it. The Doctor himself formerly taught, that when St. *Paul* says, *All Power is of God, he means only legal Power*; and that I believe was a true Exposition of the Text: But it seems he has now renounced it, as he tells us in his Preface to the *Case of Allegiance*, &c. and I know no other reason he has for so doing, but only this, because it cannot stand with his new Doctrine.

The Criticism, he says, *between* δυναμις *and* ἐξουσια, *will not do*: No matter for that, I lay no weight upon it; and yet by the by, I must tell him, δυναμις and ἐξουσια do differ in proper speaking; for the former is Power, whether legal or no; the latter is only legal Power, or Authority.

What he says, *That if St.* Paul *had meant only legal Powers, then in order to the fulfilling of this Precept, it would be necessary for Subjects to examine the Titles of Princes, and to that end to be well skill'd in the History and Laws of a Nation*, &c. is so weak an Objection, that it neither needs, nor deserves an Answer: For though he will not take the Judgment of two Parliaments, that have declared King *William* and Queen *Mary* to be lawful King and Queen of *England*; yet others think it reasonable to rest satisfied with their Declaration.

Enquiry into the Measures of Obedience.

What he adds concerning the Titles of the Roman Emperors in St. *Paul*'s Time, *That they were either stark naught, or doubtful*, I cannot allow; *for since both the People and Senate had acknowledged the Power, that* Augustus *had indeed violently usurped; it became Legal, when it was thus submitted to and confirmed both by Senate and People; and it was established in his Family by a long Prescription*, when this Epistle was written.

But

But he goes on, and tells us, *That the Reason the Apostle gives for submission to higher Powers, is not a legal Right, but the Authority of God.* To which I answer, That the Authority of God does suppose a legal Right, God giving no Authority to any one to rule over others, who are not legally deputed to the Office.

God's Authority is, I conceive, a Divine Right: Now we may distinguish of a Divine Right; for,

1. A Prince may have a Divine Right to ascend the Royal Throne: Such a Divine Right as this *Saul* and *David* had, who were expressly marked out by God; and such a Divine Right would any Prince have, if God should make any declaration in favour of him. *But this pretence of a Divine Delegation can be carried no further, than to those who are thus expressly marked out; and is unjustly claim'd by those who can prove no such Declaration to have been ever made in favour of them or their Families; nor does it appear reasonable to conclude, from their being in possession, that it is the Will of God that it should be so: This justifies all Usurpers when they are successful.* Dr. Burnets *Enquiry into the measures of Obedience, &c.*

2. A Prince may have a Divine Right to secure him in the possession of the Throne; such a Divine Right has every Prince that has a legal Right; and indeed every private Man has such a Divine Right to secure him in the possession of that which is his by Law. *And though a Man has no Divine Right to his Property, but has acquir'd it by humane Means, such as Succession or Industry; yet he has a security for the enjoyment of it from a Divine Right: So though Princes have no immediate Warrants from Heaven, either for their Original Titles, or for the extent of them, yet they are secur'd in the possession of them by the Principles and Rules of natural Religion.* Ibid.

Our Saviour's Argument, says he, *relies wholly on the possession of Power: Whose Image and Superscription has it?* In answer to this, I will only give him Dr. *Hammond*'s Comment upon the place: 'The coining of Mony is part of the Supream Power, or Regal 'Prerogative, incommunicable to any other; and your acknow-'ledging this to be the Currant Coin supposes Cesar, whose Sig-'nature it has, to be your lawful Prince, to whom therefore 'the Tribute is due, as to the legal Protector of your Civil 'Commerce: Look therefore upon your Coin for the stating 'your Question, whose Image or Signature it has on it. And 'when they confess'd it to be the Roman Emperor's Image, our 'Saviour thence concluded, *Render therefore unto Cesar the things*

'*that are Cesar's*; you that acknowledg Cesar's Supremacy over 'the Jews, ought not to dispute, but pay him that Tribute 'which is due to him as Supream.

II. *This*, he says, *gives the easiest and most intelligible account of the Original of Humane Government, that all Power is from God.* All Men do not think the Account he gives of Government is so easy and intelligible; but it matters not how easy and intelligible it is, if it be not true.

III. *This Doctrine*, he says, *is founded on the same Principle with the Doctrine of Non-resistance or Passive-Obedience.* Is it so? then it has a very weak Foundation, and there is good hope it will not stand long; for Passive Obedience, as taught by him, is knock'd down. And I wonder much that Dr. *Sherlock* would reprint his Book intitled the *Case of Resistance of the Supream Powers stated*, &c. without taking any notice of Mr. *Johnson's* Remarks upon it. But he thinks he may well despise that Authors Books, tho written with Judgment; because the Author himself, after all his Merits, is so little regarded.

SECT. III.

Reasons and Objections against Dr. Sherlock's *Doctrine.*

I. THe First Objection that I shall make, is an Objection that he himself rais'd against his own Doctrine; but I think he has not well answered it, and therefore it still remains an Objection against him; I will deliver it in his own Words.

This makes a Prince lose his Right by being notoriously injur'd; for if a prosperous Usurper gets into the Throne, and settles himself there, God has taken away his Crown, and given it to another, and therefore he ought not to attempt the recovery of his Throne, (nor any other Prince to assist him in it) which is to oppose God, and to challenge that, which he has no longer any Right to.

This is the Doctor's own Objection, and I think 'tis a very strong one; let us hear what he says to it; for I do not think he has given a satisfactory Answer.

He answers, *That the Providence of God alters no Legal Rights, nor forbids those who are dispossest of them to recover them if they can. While such a Prince is in the Throne, it is a Declaration of God's Will that he shall reign for some time, longer or shorter, as God pleases;*

and

and that is an Obligation to Subjects to submit: but that one Prince is at present plac'd in the Throne, and the other remov'd out of it, does not prove that it is Gods Will it should be always so, and therefore does not divest the dispossest Prince of his Legal Right, and Claim, nor forbid him to endeavour to recover his Throne, nor forbid those, who are under no Obligation to the Prince in Possession, to assist the dispossessed Prince to recover his Legal right.

To this I reply,

1. The Doctor owns that the dispossess'd Prince, who had God's Authority, has lost it; and methinks he should own too, that he has lost his Legal Right; for either the Authority must stay with the Legal Right, or the Legal Right must go away with the Authority; unless the Doctor will say that God Almighty has not Authority to deprive a Prince of his Legal Right. And if so, I ask the Doctor, From whom did the Prince, now dispossessed, receive his Legal Right? from God, or the People? From the People he will not say, for fear I should bring him to renounce another Principle. He must then say that the Prince deriv'd his Legal Title from God; And why may not God, who gave him a Legal Right, take it from him? And how is he sure that he has not? How does he know that Gods Providence alters no Legal Rights? God may alter Legal Rights if he pleases, and that he does not, or will not, is more than he can tell. The Legal Right therefore seems to me to be lost according to the Doctor's Principles. But,

2. Suppose the dispossessed Prince still to retain his Legal Right; I ask, Is his Legal Right the same that it was before he was dispossessed? Yes, he will say, *for the Providence of God alters no Legal Rights.* Has he then a Right to every thing that he had a Right to when he was in Possession? Yes, says he, for otherwise the Legal Right would not be the same as it was. I ask then, whether he has a Right to the Allegiance of his Subjects? No, says he, that is due now to another; that is to be paid to him who has God's Authority: Then, say I, the Legal Right either is quite gone, or at least it is not the same; for before he was dispossessed, his Legal Right did entitle him to the Allegiance of his Subjects, now it does not. The Legal Right therefore signifies nothing, and entitles him to nothing.

And what will it signify to have a Right to his Crown, if his Subjects are under an Obligation not to assist him? Why,

Why, all the Comfort that he gives his Legal King, is this, he tells him *that God does not forbid him to recover his Legal Right, nor forbids those who are under no Obligation to the Prince in Poſſeſſion, to aſſiſt him to recover his Legal Right.* But he muſt expect no Aſſiſtance from his Subjects, for indeed they are none of his Subjects now, tho he has ſtill a Legal Right to be their King.

I will deſire the Doctor to view this Matter in a like Caſe, that he may ſee the abſurdity of it.

A lays claim to certain Lands which are in the Poſſeſſion of *B*, and in order to the Recovery of them ſues *B* in *Weſtminſter-Hall*; brings his Writings and Deeds into Court, and deſires they may be read; brings his Witneſſes, and prays that they may be heard. The Judge tells him plainly, that 'tis needleſs to read over his Deeds, and examine his Writings, and hear his Witneſſes; that this will but perplex the Controverſy, and diſtract the Jury, and trouble the Court to no purpoſe; and that he has a readier way to decide the Matter: and then, immediately, without hearing the Cauſe, gives his Inſtructions to the Jury: Look you, Gentlemen, here is a Queſtion about certain Lands, which *A* claims, but *B* poſſeſſes; where the Legal Right is, whether in *A*, or *B*, we know not; nor does it concern us to enquire. It is plain, that wherever the Legal Right is, the Poſſeſſion is in *B*, and you need enquire no further: And therefore you ought to find for the Defendent. 'Tis the Will of God it ſhould be ſo, his Providence has ſo appointed it, and we muſt obey. But, mark you, Gentlemen, in caſe that *A* ſhould have the Legal Right, (which I ſay belongs not at all to you to enquire) your finding for *B* does not take away from *A* his Legal Right: It is plain that the Providence of God has remov'd *A* from the Poſſeſſion of his Lands, and has given them to *B*; but that alters no Legal Rights, nor forbids *A* who is diſpoſſeſſed of his Lands, to recover them if he can. While *B*, is in Poſſeſſion of them, it is a plain Declaration of God's Will that he ſhall have them for ſome time, longer or ſhorter, as God pleaſes; and that is ſufficient Warrant for you to find for *B*. But that *B* is at preſent in Poſſeſſion of theſe Lands, and *A* depriv'd of them, does not prove it to be God's Will it ſhould be always ſo; and therefore it does not diveſt *A* of his Legal Right and Claim, nor forbid him to endeavour to recover his Lands, nor forbid the *Mob* (who are under no Obligation to Uſurpers and Invaders of other Mens Rights and Properties, and are always kind to and ready to help injur'd Perſons) to aſſiſt *A* to recover

cover his Legal Right. For, Gentlemen, let me tell you, Legal Right is the ordinary way, whereby the Providence of God disposes of Lands, and this bars all other humane Claims; but yet God may give the Lands of *A* to *B* if he pleases; but this does not destroy the Legal Right of *A*, who is depriv'd of his Lands, nor hinder him from raising the *Mob* to eject *B vi & Armis*.

This is the very Doctrine that this Author teaches; and if this be not Enthusiasm, I know not what is. One would admire that any Man, who converses so much with Lawyers, should advance such a Doctrine which destroys all our Laws, and unsettles our Civil Rights and Properties, and tends to nothing but Confusion: For if this Doctrine be true that he teaches, the Lawyers may fling away their Law-Books, and shut up *Westminster*-Hall; for why should Clients come to them for Advice, if this were the best Advice they could give, that they should raise as great a Force as they can to recover their Legal Rights? for this might have been done without consulting of them. Surely the Lawyers will con him no Thanks for this Book: But what does he care? he is above the Lawyers, and above the Law too; and by his own Authority, join'd with that of the Convocation, can repeal all our Laws, and null Acts of Parliament, and declare, that whatever the Law or Custom has hitherto been, yet for the future Possession alone shall give Right.

Nay, by this Doctor's Principles, a Murderer is the Minister of God, and ought to be cleared in any of the King's Courts. For let us suppose *B* to be murdered, and *A* to have been the Murderer. I will by the Doctor's Principles teach *A* how he shall defend himself. *A* therefore shall own the Fact, that he did really kill *B*; but he had an Impulse from God so to do; and this Impulse was equivalent to a Divine Command, and a Divine Command is a sufficient Warrant for any Man to send another out of the World. The Judg interrogates him further, how he can prove that he had an Impulse from God? 'Tis plain, says *A*, that this Impulse was from God, because without his Power I could not have done it, and God never intrusts any Man with power to kill another, unless he give him Authority to do it. So that Providence is the Murderer and not I. The Judg then, well instructed in Dr. *Sherlock*'s Principles, tells the Jury, that here is one of our Sovereign Lord the King's Subjects murder'd, and that *A* owns he did it; but they must bring him in *Not Guilty*, because though he did kill the Man, yet he did it with God's Authority.

I dread to mention the horrid and blasphemous consequences of this fanatical and enthusiastical Doctrine: for hereby all Villanies, and Thefts, and Murders, and Massacres, every thing that is abominable both to God and Man, will be charg'd on God. And this is a sufficient Argument that it cannot be true.

II. I will borrow another Objection of Dr. *Sherlock*'s, and that is this; *Have not Pirats and Robbers as good a Title to my Purse, as an Usurper has to the Crown, which he seizes by an manifest Force and Violence? Does not the Providence of God order and dispose all these Events? And are we not bound then as much to submit to Pirats, as to Usurpers?*

To which he gives this Answer, *The dispute is not about Humane and Legal Right in either Case.* True, for neither has a Robber any legal Title to my Purse, nor has an Usurper any legal Right to the Crown; *but the dispute is about Authority, which is the only reason of a conscientious Subjection.* But what, I beseech him, is this Authority, which he says the Dispute is about? Is it Humane and Legal Authority? No, for that is the same with Humane and Legal Right. *It is*, he tells us, *God's Authority. Now no Man*, says he, *pretends that Thieves and Pirats have God's Authority, to which we must submit.* And I wonder that any Man should pretend that Usurpers have God's Authority, to which we must submit. God's Authority is a Divine Right: Now I think an Usurper has no more a Divine Right to seize the Publick Treasure of a Nation, and to take a thousand thousand Purses at once, than a Robber has to take one Purse; and I am no more in Conscience bound to submit to an Usurper, and not to resist him, than I am bound to submit to a Robber, and tamely to deliver my Purse to him. I beseech him to tell me, why Tyrants and Usurpers have a Divine Right to their stollen Goods, but Robbers and Pirats have it not? The Reason he assures us is this, *The Scripture expresly tells us, that Kingdoms are dispos'd by God.* And I ask him, Are not Mens Purses, and Mony, and Goods at his disposal? Are not all Things his? And who shall dispose of what is his, but himself? Does God dispose only of Crowns and Scepters, and leave lesser Matters to be dispos'd of by others? As therefore he thus argues, *All Power is of God, and therefore whenever any Prince, by what unjust means soever with respect to Men, is plac'd in the Throne, and settled there, he is advanc'd by God, is God's Ordinance, God's Minister, and must be obey'd for Conscience-*

sake.

false. So in like manner I will argue according to his Principles thus: All Riches are of God, *(for Riches and Honours come of him)* And therefore when any Robber, by what unjust means soever with respect to Men, gets Riches, he is enriched by God, is God's Steward, and God has but taken away the Stewardship from another, and given it to him; and he may as properly call the Goods he has unjustly gotten, his own, as the former Steward could, when they were in his keeping. And therefore *the Outrages of Pirats and Thieves are* not *impertinently alledg'd in this Cause. They have*, says he, *Force and Violence, which every Man must submit to, when he cannot help it.* And what else have Usurpers, but Force and Violence, which every Man must submit to, when he cannot help it? O, he tells us, *Sovereign Power is God's Authority, though Princes may be advanced to it by no honester Means, than Thieves take a Purse.* I ask him, Does he think that a Prince, who is advanc'd to Sovereign Power by no honester Means than Thieves take a Purse, has any Divine Right to his Crown? Yes, he will say, because God has given him a Crown. But how has God given him a Crown? He will answer, by *the disposals of his Providence.* In like manner may I say, that a Robber has a Divine Right to his ill-gotten Goods, for God has given them to him by *the disposals of his Providence.* 1 Chron. 29. 12.

And whereas he says, *The beginnings of the four first Monarchies were no better, and yet their Power was of God*; I may with full as much reason say, that the beginnings of some poor and mean Robbers, who afterwards grow Rich by spoiling others, are not one jot worse than the unjust beginnings of the four Monarchies; and therefore their unjustly-gotten Wealth is of God. I will undertake to make out, that Thieves have as much Divine Right to their stollen Goods, as any Usurper has to his Crown. But to push the Matter further.

III. Suppose that *A* has unjustly gotten the Government into his Hands, and by Force and Violence settled himself in it, and consequently, according to his Doctrine, has got God Almighty's Authority. I ask the Doctor, who gave *A* Authority to get God Almighty's Authority into his Hands? Will he say, God gave him Authority to get God Almighty's Authority? If so, then *A* did not sin; for no Man sins that acts by God's Authority; and yet he did sin, because he us'd very unjust means to get God's Authority. Will he say, that Man gave him Authority to

get God's Authority into his Hands? Then Man gave him Authority to ſin againſt God, (for I ſuppoſe he gets God's Authority by unjuſt means) but no Man can do this; no Man can give another what he has not himſelf, for no Man has Authority to ſin againſt God.

We have thus brought our *Uſurper* to the Steps of the Royal Throne, without any Authority; but now we muſt change his Name, and call him *Uſurper* no longer; tho he aſcended the Throne an *Uſurper*, yet he is no ſooner in it, but he is *God's Ordinance*, *God's Miniſter*, *God's Lieutenant*, *God's Vicegerent*, *God's Anointed*. He was, whilſt he made his way to the Throne, an unjuſt Oppreſſor, and a Murderer, for he waded through Blood to it: But behold a ſudden Converſion, a wonderful Change wrought on him; a wonderful Change indeed, like that of Tranſubſtantiation; for though he be made God's Vicegerent, and has received from him a Commiſſion to be his Miniſter for the Good of his People; yet ſtill he is, what he was before, a Devil. But behold him ſitting upon the Royal Throne, with a Crown on his Head, and a Scepter in his Hand, full of Majeſty, and having God's Authority to beſtow Biſhopricks and Deaneries on thoſe of the Clergy that flatter him, and to kill and murder the Laity as faſt as he pleaſes. Dr. *Hicks* immediately haſtens to Court; and leſt the new Prince ſhould commit a miſtake in governing according to the *Political Law*, he inſtructs him in the Nature and full Extent of his *Imperial Law*, and preſents *Jovian* to him. Dr. *Sherlock* comes next, and acquaints his Sacred Majeſty, that he has God's Authority, which is always irreſiſtible; and forthwith preſenteth his two Caſes, the one of *Allegiance*, &c. the other of *Reſiſtance*, &c. But he wiſely takes care to blot out that Paſſage in his Caſe of Reſiſtance, *&c.* P. 128. *That when St.* Paul *ſays*, *All Power is of God*, *he means only Legal Power*; for the Book with that Paſſage in it would be a very unfit Preſent for an Uſurper.

Next comes *the Guide of the Inferior Clergy*, and aſſures his Majeſty, that he is ready to ſerve him with Tongue and Pen, and promiſes the ſame in the Name of all his Scholars. Then come the Addreſſers from Cities and Corporations, and theſe tender their Lives, and Fortunes, and Obedience, without reſerve. The Diſpenſing Judges bring up the Rear; and theſe bring the Body of the Laws in their Hands, and lay them at his Majeſty's Feet, aſſuring him, that (notwithſtanding whatever *Bracton*, and *Forteſcue*,

Forteſcue, and other famous Lawyers have ſaid to the contrary) he is above the Law, and may if he liſt rule without it. And now, if we will take Dr. *Sherlock*'s word for it, the Uſurper is *ſettled in his Throne, the whole Adminiſtration of the Government, and the whole Power of the Nation is in his Hands; every thing is done in his Name, and by his Authority*, (tho, as I have ſhew'd, Authority he has none) *the great Body of the Nation has ſubmitted to him, and thoſe who will not ſubmit can be cruſh'd by him whenever he pleaſes:* This, this is his Right and Title to the Crown, *that he can cruſh thoſe who will not ſubmit, whenever he pleaſes. And if this be not a ſettled Government, he deſpairs of ever knowing what it is.*

But ſtill all this is nothing but Force and Violence, there is no Authority: For the Uſurper has no more God's Authority now he ſits on the Throne, than he had before he aſcended it; Power and Authority are not the ſame; for though all Authority be Power, yet all Power is not Authority; and though it ſhould grow or ſwell never ſo much, yet it cannot grow and ſwell into Authority; ſtill it will be Force and Power, and no more.

True ſays the Doctor, I grant that Power cannot give Right and Authority to govern, (for that is *Hobbiſm*, and he is no *Hobbiſt*). *But*, ſays he, *'tis a certain ſign, that where-ever God has plac'd the Power, he has given the Authority. For ſince Power will govern, God ſo orders it by his Providence, as never to intruſt Sovereign Power in any Man's hands, to whom he does not give Sovereign Authority.* Now here indeed is the pinch of the Matter, and therefore I ſhall endeavour to eaſe my ſelf and my Reader of it. Pag. 15.

The Doctor allows, that Sovereign Power is not Sovereign Authority, and herein we agree; *But*, ſays he, *it is a certain ſign, that where God has plac'd the Sovereign Power, he has given the Authority.* But this I deny, and thus I argue againſt it.

Power is not a certain ſign of Authority, and therefore Sovereign Power is not a certain ſign of Sovereign Authority; for 'tis every jot as reaſonable, that Power ſhould be a ſign of ſome Authority given by God to him who has the Power, as it is that Sovereign Power ſhould be a certain ſign of Sovereign Authority. For as the Doctor argues, *Since Power will govern, God ſo orders it by his Providence, as never to intruſt Sovereign Power in any Man's hands, to whom he gives not Sovereign*

Authority. So in like manner do I argue: Since all Power, though it be less than Sovereign, will govern as far as it can; that is, will give Law to, and domineer over those that have less Power, and will oppress and crush them, (which is, in the Doctor's sense, to govern) God so orders it by his Providence, as never to intrust any Power in any Man's hands, to whom he does not give some Authority: And the Consequence of this is, that every one who is stronger than Dr. *Sherlock* has Authority to govern him; for God, it seems, would not have given him sufficient Power to govern the Doctor, unless he had annex'd Authority thereto. And this, if it be not *Hobbism*, yet is so like to it, that it is not easy for any one who has not Dr. *Sherlock*'s subtilty, to distinguish it from *Hobbism*. I cannot think the Doctor will allow that any one who has Power to govern him, has also Authority; and yet by his Principles he ought to allow it. For whatever Reason he will assign, why, *Since Power will govern, God so orders it by his Providence, as never to intrust Sovereign Power in the hands of any Man to whom he does not give Sovereign Authority*; Whatever Reason he will or can assign for this, will serve me for a Reason to prove that God does not, or according to the Doctor's principle, should not intrust any Power, though less than Sovereign, in the hands of any Man, to whom he does not give some Authority in proportion to it. So that if this Argument of his proves any thing, the fault of it is, that it proves too much; for if it proves what he would have, that God gives Authority to Tyrants, it proves also what he would not, that God gives Authority to all Oppressors. Methinks such a startling Assertion as this, should have been prov'd by our Author, he ought to have given some reason for it, for all Men will not take it upon his Authority. But since he has given us no reason for it, I will examine what colour of reason there may be for it, for a good reason there can be none. If God so orders matters, as never to entrust Sovereign Power in the hands of any Man to whom he does not give Sovereign Authority, the most likely reason of it is this, because Sovereign Power may do a great deal of mischief in the World; and 'tis not agreeable to a wise and just and good God, to permit that any one should have such a Power without his Authority annexed to it.

Now to this I answer;

1. They who have Sovereign Power without God's Authority, are as much under the Restraint and Government of God, as

as they who have Sovereign Power with his Authority: and therefore God can prevent and ſtop the proudeſt of Uſurpers and Tyrants from doing all the miſchief they intend; and ſo he does, whenever ſo to do will tend moſt to the honour of his own Name, and to the good of his People; for a mighty Uſurper, how great ſoever his Power is, is but the *Rod of God's Anger*, (as it was ſaid of *Sennacherib*) and God ſurely has the holding of the *Rod*: And whether the *Rod* ſhall draw Blood or no, depends on the Pleaſure of him that holds it. He is God's *Axe*, and whether the *Axe* ſhall cut or no, depends on the Will of him that has it in his Hands, and may or may not hew therewith. Iſa. 10. 15. *And ſhall the Axe boaſt it ſelf againſt him that heweth therewith? Or ſhall the Saw magnify it ſelf againſt him that ſhaketh it? As if the Rod ſhould ſhake it ſelf againſt them that lift it up? Or as if the Staff ſhould lift up it ſelf, as if it were no Wood.* Such mean, and weak, and contemptible things, are the greateſt and proudeſt Uſurpers and Tyrants, when compar'd with God. The pretence therefore, that Sovereign Power is capable of doing a great deal of Miſchief and Evil in the World (as indeed it is) can be no reaſon why God ſhould never ſuffer it to be lodg'd in the hands of any one, to whom he gives not Sovereign Authority, becauſe he can check and reſtrain the Power of Uſurpers and Tyrants as he pleaſes.

2. The annexing of Sovereign Authority to Sovereign Power, will not hinder thoſe who have the Authority from abuſing their Power, and going beyond their Authority. And therefore this Conſideration, that Sovereign Power is capable of doing a great deal of Evil and Miſchief in the World, is no reaſon why we ſhould ſay that God gives Sovereign Authority with it; becauſe Sovereign Power, whether with or without Authority, is equally capable of doing miſchief; for 'tis the Man himſelf that does miſchief, and not the Power, though indeed he could not do ſo much miſchief without ſo much Power; and 'tis the Grace of God that muſt reſtrain him from doing miſchief, and not his Authority.

3. If this were a good reaſon why God ſhould never intruſt Sovereign Power in any Man's hands, to whom he gives not Sovereign Authority, it would likewiſe ſerve for a reaſon why he ſhould not intruſt a leſs than Sovereign Power in any Man's hands to whom he does not give ſome Authority; and yet we find that he, in the courſe of his Providence, does intruſt leſs than

Sovereign

Sovereign Power in the hands of thoſe to whom he gives no Authority: As the Power that every Oppreſſor has, is from God, but God ſurely gives him no Authority to oppreſs.

IV. But let us ſuppoſe now that whoever has Sovereign Power, has alſo Sovereign Authority, and muſt not be reſiſted, and then I will prove, that the Sovereign Authority is always in the People; for bare Sovereign Power is only Sovereign Force, and Sovereign Force is the greateſt natural Strength; and ſurely the greateſt ſtrength is in the People, if the Doctor will allow me that five or ſix Millions of Men have more ſtrength than one ſingle Man who is ſeated on the Throne. Nay, according to this Principle, Sovereign Authority can never be any where elſe but in the People; becauſe the People cannot part with their ſtrength, nor confer it on the Supream Magiſtrate; it is ſo their own, that they cannot give it away. But you'l ſay, they may promiſe, that they will not uſe their natural ſtrength otherwiſe than the Supream Magiſtrate, or than the Law ſhall direct. True; but though they promiſe that they will not uſe their natural ſtrength otherwiſe than the Law directs, yet ſtill they retain it; nor are they, upon their making of ſuch a Promiſe, weaker than they were before, there being not the leaſt abatement of their natural ſtrength: So that if they had Sovereign Power before they made ſuch a Promiſe, it follows that they have it ſtill. And therefore if (as he ſays) *Power be a certain ſign to us, that where God has plac'd the Power, he has given the Authority*; It is infallibly true, that the Authority is in the People, and can be no where elſe, becauſe there God has plac'd the Power.

Hence I obſerve,

1. That the Doctor is really no Friend to crowned Heads, for he has unking'd them all; he has taken away from them their Sovereign Authority, and given it to the People. Now ſuppoſe that an oppreſſed People ſhould be ſenſible that they have the ſuperior Strength, and ſhould be ſo cunning as from thence to conclude with the Doctor, that they have God's Authority to deliver themſelves from the Yoke of the Oppreſſor; I think, according to his Principles, he ought to allow, they have Authority to free themſelves from Oppreſſion, becauſe they have Power, Supream Power, or ſtrength lodg'd in them; and *God never intruſts Sovereign Power in any Man's (or Mens) hands, to whom he does not give Sovereign Authority.* Beſides it may be conſider'd,

consider'd, that though, when they see an Usurper on the Throne, they should with the Doctor conclude it to be *God's Will, that he should reign for some time longer or shorter as God pleases:* Yet they are taught by the Doctor, *That this does not prove it to be God's Will it should be always so.* And therefore when they find they have strength to resist the Tyrant, and can agree together to make use of it, they will presently conclude, that it is not God's Will that they should be Slaves one Week or Day longer. And thus the Doctor's Tyrant is on a sudden tumbled down from his Royal Throne by that very Argument, that he made use of to set him up.

2. That the Doctor is fallen out with the University of *Oxford* who condemn'd this Principle, *That all Civil Authority is deriv'd originally from the People*; and if the Fires be still continued there, his Book will be in some danger. Nay, he is all on a sudden fallen out with himself; and from being a mighty Assertor of the Prerogatives and Rights of Kings, is become a Republican: And who can doubt but for the future, *Lex Rex*, *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*, *Milton's Defensio populi Anglicani*, and such-like Books, will be in great esteem with him.

But this is only a slip of the Doctor; he still means well to Kings, especially if they be such as he sets up.

Now *England*, behold the King that Doctor *Sherlock* gives thee! he is an absolute Lord, and some will call him Tyrant. For,

V. He that is a Sovereign Prince, and has God's Authority but no Legal Right, is an absolute and unlimited Monarch; and consequently such a King as *England* never yet own'd; for it is Law that sets bounds to Regal Power; and therefore he that is our King, but not by Law, is an absolute and unlimited Monarch. And I am sure whatever Notions some Men, who understand little of our Laws, have concerning the boundless Power and uncontroulable Authority of Kings, yet the Laws do really bound the Regal Power; this the Lawyers teach us: This is the Doctrine of *Westminster*-Hall. And I think in a matter of this nature, it is more reasonable to take the Judgment of Lawyers than of Divines.

VI. He that has God's Authority without any Legal Right, cannot be limited by Laws: For God's Authority cannot be limited by Men; and therefore if it be true, that he who has no legal Right to govern, has God's Authority when he is settled in the Throne, then it follows that he has an Authority that cannot

not be bounded by humane Laws. For a Power that God gives none can ſet bounds to, beſides God; and if he has made no limitations of the Regal Power, (as 'tis plain he has not, juſt as plain as it is that he has ſaid nothing about it) then no limitations can be made: ſuch a King cannot yield that any limits ſhould be ſet to God's Authority which he is inveſted with, unleſs he ſhould have a new Authority from Heaven impowring him to do ſo: And the People cannot ſet bounds to it, neither with nor without his Conſent; not without the King's Conſent, for that would be rebelling againſt God's Vicegerent, and trampling on Divine Authority, that would be no leſs than a robbing of God, a ſtealing of God's Authority, and the worſt of Sacriledges: nor can they ſet bounds to his Power with his Conſent; for if he cannot part with any of his Power, they cannot take it, for that would be like receiving of ſtollen Goods.

Beſides, it may be conſidered, that ſurely God gives a Prince no more of his Authority, than is fit and neceſſary to ſerve the Ends of Government; and therefore he cannot part with any of it; or if he ſhould, he would not have enough left him to ſerve the Ends of Government; at leaſt he could not be ſure that he ſhould have enough, unleſs he were alſo ſure of this, that God at firſt gave him more than enough; which he cannot be certain of. He may indeed know that he has more than he needs for his preſent Occaſions; but he does not know how ſoon the Scene of Affairs may change; and then all *God's Authority*, even the whole *Imperial Law* may be little enough for him.

I have as much Zeal and dutiful Affection for their Sacred Majeſties, King *William* and Queen *Mary*, as any of my fellow-Subjects; and as I believe them to have as good a Title to the Crown of *England*, as any of their Royal Anceſtors ever had; ſo I hope they are ſo firmly ſettled in the Throne, that all the Powers on Earth will not be able to remove them. But I think Dr. *Sherlock* does by his Principles undermine their Throne; for though he *inveſts them with God's Authority, becauſe they have the Sovereign Power, are able to cruſh whom they pleaſe, and are ſettled in the Throne*; yet he will not own them to have a legal Right to ſit thereon; whereas it is moſt certain, that there is nothing can ſecure to a Prince his Sovereign Power, but that which ſets bounds to it, the Law.

SECT.

SECT. IV.

Wherein is shew'd how little value we ought to have for the Acts and Canons of the Convocation, begun in the first Year of King James I. 1603.

FOR, to the Authority of the Convocation begun in the first Year of King *James* I, I may oppose the Authority of several Convocations in the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, wherein the Bishops and Clergy were of a contrary Opinion. I shall instance in two only, the one in the 35*th*, and the other in the 39*th* Year of that Queen's Reign.

1. In the 35*th* of Q. *Elizabeth*, the Clergy were of Opinion, that an Usurper, though settled in the Throne, had not God's Authority, and no Allegiance was due to him, as appears plainly from their granting the Queen two Subsidies of four Shillings in the Pound, to assist the *Dutch* in shaking off their Obedience to their once Sovereign the King of *Spain*. 35 *Eliz.* c. 12. *The Prelates and Clergy of the Province of* Canterbury *have, for certain Considerations, lovingly and liberally given and granted to the Queen's most excellent Majesty two Subsidies of Four Shillings in the Pound.* What were those Considerations? Amongst others this was one, *The consideration of her Majesty's great Charges in the provident and needful prevention of such intended Attempts as manifestly tended to the utter overthrow of the present happy state of her Highness's Realm, to the miserable ruin of divers other Princes and Countries associate and near adjoining, and to the extirpation and rooting out of the sincere profession of the Gospel both here and elsewhere.* The Temporalities Subsidy-Act explains this to us in these Reasons for their Tax, *Cap.* 13. "*Besides the great and perpetual Honour which it has pleased God to give your Majesty abroad, in making You the principal Support of all just and religious Causes against Usurpers: So that this Island has in your Majesty's Days been as a Stay and Sanctuary to distressed States and Kingdoms, and as a Bulwark against the Tyranny of mighty and usurping Potentates.* ——— *Besides the great Succours in* France *and* Flanders, *which we do conceive to be most Honourable, in regard of the Ancient League, the Justice and Equity of their Causes,* &c. These were the chief Reasons that moved the Clergy to give four Shillings in the Pound to the

Queen. This was read a third time, (*Mar.*30.1593.) in the Lords House, these following Bishops being present, and no *Dissentientes* among them, as appears from the Journals of the Lords House.

Godwin *de Præsulibus.*

Cantuarienſis.	*Johannes Whitgift.*
Londinenſis.	*Johan. Elmer.*
Aſaphenſis.	*Gulielmus Hughes.*
Roffenſis.	*Johannes Young.*
Exonienſis.	*Johannes Woolton.*
Ciceſtrenſis.	*Thomas Bickley.*
Licolnienſis.	*Gulielmus Wickham.*
Petroburgenſis.	*Richardus Howland.*
Herefordenſis.	*Herbert Weſtfaling.*
Bangorenſis.	*Hugo Bellott.*
Wigornienſis.	*Richardus Fletcher.*
Landavenſis.	*Gervaſius Babington.*
Sarisburienſis.	*Richardus Coldwell.*
Bathonenſ. & Wellenſis.	*Johannes Still.*

Now I think it is plain from hence, that the Bishops and Clergy, in the 35*th* of Queen *Elizabeth*, did believe that an Usurper, though he be settled in the Throne, has not God's Authority, and that those who are oppress'd by him, may lawfully resist him, and free themselves from his Yoke; for had they been of Opinion that it was a Sin in the Dutch to resist *Philip* the 2*d* King of *Spain*, as having God's Authority; would they not have directed her Majesty's Conscience better in this Matter? would they not have humbly represented to her Highness, that though *Philip* the 2*d* was an Usurper, yet he had God's Authority, and therefore neither ought his Subjects to resist him, nor she to assist them in making resistance? Would they not have given her Sacred Majesty good *Advice* rather than *Money*? Would they not have admonished the Dutch to lay down their Arms, and fly to their *Prayers* and *Tears*? Who can think they would have been so uncharitable to their Protestant Neighbours, as to set forward their Damnation, or so foolish as to buy their own at the rate of Four Shillings in the Pound? Such Actions as these do plainly shew what Opinion Arch-Bishop *Whitgift*, Bishop *Elmer*, and the rest of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Bishops and Clergy had concerning this Matter; and that as plainly as the Acts and

and Canons of a Convocation.

It may here be very proper to consider, that the King of *Spain* had once a Legal Right to govern the Dutch, who were his Subjects, and ow'd him Allegiance; but the Prelats and Clergy of the Church of *England* did verily believe he had forfeited and lost it by usurping upon them; (for it seems, they were of Opinion, that a Prince might usurp upon his Subjects, as well as Subjects upon their Prince) and this I believe was our Case, King *James* the 2*d* having been that to us, which *Philip* the 2*d* was to the Dutch.

That which I gather from hence, is this, That Queen *Elizabeth*'s Bishops, either did not think that an Usurper was invested with God's Authority; or if they did, they believed it lawful in some Cases to resist a Prince though invested with God's Authority. Now let Dr. *Sherlock* chuse which of the two he will grant me, for I think it cannot be avoided but one of the two must be allow'd.

2. In the 39*th* of *Elizabeth*, Chap. 26. The Clergy think themselves bound, *&c. to offer unto her Highness as a Testimony and Token of their good Wills and dutiful Affections, some such Aid and Contribution towards the Supportation of her Majesties Charges, as they are perswaded the greatness of the same most justly may require.* And the Temporalities Subsidy-Act, 39 *Eliz. c.* 27. has these words; *This Land is become, since your Majesti's happy Days, both a Port and a Haven of Refuge for distressed States and Kingdoms, and a Rock and Bulwark of Opposition against the Tyrannies and ambitious Attempts of mighty and usurping Potentates.* This pass'd the House of Lords *Dec.* 19. 1596; fourteen Bishops being present and agreeing to it, one of which was Arch-Bishop *Whitgift*, &c.

The conclusion from hence is easy, that in the 39*th* of Queen *Elizabeth*'s reign the Prelates and Clergy own'd not this Doctrine, that *Usurpers, when settled in the Throne, are invested with God's Authority, and must be obey'd by all those who live within their Territories and Dominions, as well Priests as People.*

Besides, it ought to be consider'd, that the Acts and Canons of this Convocation wherein Dr. *Overall* was Prolocutor, were never ratified in Parliament.

But you will say, They however give us the Judgment of the then Church of *England*.

To this I answer;

1. That here is Church against Church, and Convocation against Convocation, nay two Convocations (and I might have said four) in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign against one in the Reign of her immediate Successor, K. *James*. Now methinks the Authority of two or more Convocations in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign, should outweigh the Authority of one single Convocation in the reign of King *James*; unless it can be made out, that the Church grows wiser and better every Age and every Year than other, which I make some doubt of.

2. That in the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, the Head of the Church agreed with the Members; for both the Queen and her Convocations were of Opinion, that 'twas lawful for the *Hollanders* to shake off their Obedience to their once Sovereign King *Philip*; but in the following reign of King *James*, the Head of the Church and the Members differ'd about this Point, and the King was on the *Hollander*'s side; as appears from a Letter which that King wrote to Dr. *Abbot*; Part of which I have thought fit to transcribe.

Good Dr. Abbot,

New Obs. Vol. 3. Numb. 22.

"I Cannot abstain to give you my Judgment of your Proceedings in your Convocation, as you call it;---You know all of you, as I think, that my Reason of calling you together, was "to give your Judgments how far a Christian and a Protestant "King, may concur to assist his Neighbours to shake off their O"bedience to their once Sovereign, upon the Account of Op"pression, Tyranny, or what else you like to name it. In the "late Queen's time, this Kingdom was very free in assisting the "*Hollanders* both with Arms and Advice. And none of your "Coat ever told me, that any scrupled about it in her Reign. "Upon my coming to *England*, you may know that it came from "some of your selves to raise Scruples about this Matter. "---Yet I never took any notice of these Scruples, till the Affairs "of *Spain* and *Holland* forc'd me to it. All my Neighbours call "on me to concur in the Treaty between *Holland* and *Spain*; "and the Honour of the Nation will not suffer the *Hollanders* "to be abandoned, especially after so much Money and Men "spent in their Quarrel: Therefore I was of the Mind to call

"my

" my Clergy together, to satisfy not so much me, as the " World about us of the Justness of my owning the *Hollanders* " at this time: This I needed not have done; and you have " forced me to say, I wish I had not. You have dipp'd too deep " in what all Kings reserve among the *Arcana Imperii*. And " whatever Aversion you may profess against God's being the " Author of Sin, you have stumbled upon the Threshold of " that Opinion, in saying upon the Matter, that even Tyran- " ny is God's Authority, and should be reverenc'd as such. If " the King of *Spain* should return to claim his old Pontifical " Right to my Kingdom, you leave me to seek for others to " fight for it: For you tell us upon the Matter beforehand, " his Authority is God's Authority, if he prevail.

" Mr. Doctor, I have no time to express my Mind farther in " this thorny business. I shall give you my Orders about it by " Mr. Solicitor; and until then, meddle no more in it, for " they are Edge-Tools, or rather like that Weapon, that's " said to cut with the one edge, and cure with the other. I " commit you to God's Protection, good Doctor *Abbot*, and " rest,

Your good Friend, *James* R.

And this I think lessens the Authority of Dr. *Overall*'s Convocation very much, that it is the Authority of a Church without a Head; for it is plain, that the Head of the Church is on my side. And I lay some weight on this, that King *James* who was a Sovereign Prince, and as fond of Power as any other, plainly told Dr. *Abbot*, that he scrupled not about the Lawfulness of what the *Hollanders* did in shaking off their Obedience to their once Sovereign the King of *Spain*, upon the account of his Oppression and Tyranny.

Hence we may gather, that were K. *James* I. to judg between the late King his Grand-Son, and the People of *England*; he would surely give Judgment on the Peoples side; for he cannot condemn the People of *England* without condemning the Dutch: And his Judgment in this Case I think we ought to value more, than the Opinions of an hundred Doctors that differ from him.

But 'tis time now to draw to a conclusion. The Cause I am engaged in, is God's Cause, and the King's and Queen's Cause, and the Peoples Cause: it is God's Cause, whom Dr. *Sherlock* seems, by his Principles, to make the Author of Sin: for *whatever*

ever averſion he may profeſs against God's being the Author of Sin, has ſtumbled upon the threſhold of that Opinion, in ſaying upon the Matter, that even Tyranny is God's Authority, and ſhould be reverenc'd as ſuch. And it is the King's and Queen's Cauſe, whom the Doctor ſuppoſes to be Uſurpers, though I do not ſay he has call'd them ſo. I know no neceſſity there was for his writing on this Argument; and much leſs for his reaſoning on the ſuppoſition of unjuſt Uſurpations; for here was no ſuch thing as Uſurpation, unleſs to defend our Civil Rights and Liberties, and Religion eſtabliſh'd by Law, muſt be call'd Uſurpation; and unleſs he will call an excellent Prince, who came to deliver us from Popery and Slavery, an Uſurper. And though it may be allowable to *put the Caſe*, as he ſays, *at the worſt*; yet methinks he ought not to have left it *at the worſt*; he ſhould not have let his Reader run away with this Opinion, that King *William* and Queen *Mary* have not a Legal Title to the Crown. And though he forbids his Reader to *charge him with reflecting on the preſent Government*, yet there is no intelligent Reader but muſt take his whole Book to be a Reflection upon it; and will conclude from his not declaring King *William* and Queen *Mary* to have a Legal Right to the Crown, that he does not believe it: For a wiſe Man, I think, would have declar'd it, had he believ'd it; and Dr. *Sherlock never gave any juſt occaſion to the World to mark him out for a Fool.* And it is the Peoples Cauſe, I mean it is the Cauſe of all thoſe that are the King's and Queen's Loyal Subjects; for ſince he ſays, That *all Sovereign Princes, who are ſetled in their Thrones, are plac'd there by God, and inveſted with his Authority, and therefore muſt be obey'd*, even though they turn Uſurpers, and oppreſs their Subjects, and deſtroy the Fundamental Conſtitutions of the Government; it is plain that he charges all thoſe who aſſiſted his Highneſs the Prince of *Orange*, and were the ſubordinate Inſtruments of our Deliverance, with down-right Rebellion againſt the late King. And theſe were the Reaſons that mov'd me to engage my ſelf in this Controverſy. Whether I have detected the Doctor's Errors, and defended the Truth as I ought, I leave the Reader to judg. God be thanked, we have a Prince, who wants not courage to defend his Legal Right with his Sword; and I believe he will never want Writers to juſtify it with their Pens; and to prove that neither was he an Uſurper, nor were they that aſſiſted him, Rebels.

Preface.

FINIS.